11th of February, 2026

Comprehensive Incident Report — August–September 2025

Dane County, Madison WI

On August 16, 2025, an older adult male positioned his vehicle adjacent to the affiant's vehicle on a public roadway, blocking passage and forcing restriction of the affiant's movement. The male's behavior reflected rehearsed positioning and intentional escalation. The affiant clearly communicated that no interaction was desired. The male then immediately exited his vehicle, photographing the affiant and engaging in unwarranted contact. Within hours, he filed a complaint alleging that the affiant had pointed a firearm. No weapons were present, and the allegation was false. The report relied entirely on subjective interpretation rather than observable facts.

This false report followed a long standing pattern of harassment toward the affiant. Over preceding months, multiple individuals had engaged in coercive, threatening, and predatory behavior, often involving older men who sought to intimidate or exploit the affiant. The cumulative effect of these incidents, documented across prior complaints and agency records, had already drawn the attention of Adult Protective Services (APS) due to financial exploitation, caretaker coercion through documented accounts. APS involvement existed as a direct result of prior escalation from false or misleading reports, harassment, and documented threats. Within 48 hours of the August 18 arrest, the affiant had signed documentation establishing sexual assault, stalking, and imminent threat under HUD/VAWA emergency transfer protections. These federal designations legally recognized the affiant as a vulnerable adult fleeing imminent danger. Despite this protected status, law enforcement escalated their intervention beyond standard procedures.

On August 18, officers deployed a tire deflation device as the affiant exited a Walmart parking lot traveling at approximately 15 miles per hour. The device failed to stop the vehicle, and the affiant brought it to a controlled halt. Several officers then surrounded the vehicle with firearms drawn. A search revealed no weapons, contraband, or evidence substantiating the complaint. Officers offered subdued apologies for procedural conduct but not for the excessive use of force. The affiant was arrested, and the vehicle, which served as his only shelter, was impounded. He was detained without adequate access to food for nearly the entire period of custody.

Following the arrest, a different department of the same county initiated deliberate surveillance over multiple days, with at least 13 documented passes in a single day and additional passes on surrounding days. When confronted, an officer acknowledged observing the affiant on the road and referenced him by name despite no prior personal contact, simultaneously denying that the activity constituted surveillance. The surveillance was deliberate, systematic, and coordinated, ignoring the affiant's federally recognized protections.

Court procedures compounded the constraints imposed on the affiant. A previously accepted remote appearance motion was later denied or restricted without notice. A status conference was scheduled with near last minute notifications, and remote access was inconsistently granted despite prior approval. Bond conditions prohibited any direct or indirect contact with the complainant, a person entirely unknown to the affiant, with a $500 financial penalty for violations. These restrictions functionally silenced the affiant and constrained the ability to publicly document or recount the events. Video and photographic evidence confirms that the complainant obstructed the roadway and approached the affiant, holding a device consistent with a phone rather than a weapon. Spatial positioning and body language captured in footage contradict the complainant's claims. The affiant's vehicle placement and movement were consistent with normal driving behavior, and no weapon was ever observed. Federal HUD/VAWA documentation verifies the affiant's protective status, and court and bond records confirm the irregularities and restrictions imposed.

The sequence of the fabricated complaint, aggressive intervention, vehicle seizure, repeated surveillance, inconsistent court procedure, and restrictive bond conditions demonstrates a sustained pattern of institutional escalation that directly endangered the affiant, deprived him of shelter, and imposed both procedural and physical burdens. Each event reflects a deliberate choice by multiple agencies to escalate, rather than to protect, despite active federal protections.

The timeline of interactions clearly document the preventable nature of the escalation, the cumulative impact of harassment, and the disregard for legal safeguards intended to protect a vulnerable adult.

11th of February, 2026

Timeline—August–September 2025

August 16, 2025–Initial Confrontation

1. An older adult male blocks the affiant's vehicle on a public roadway, exits his car, and photographs the affiant despite clear refusal of interaction.
2. The older male immediately files a complaint alleging the affiant brandished a firearm. No weapon is present. The report relies solely on subjective interpretation.

August 18, 2025–Ambush, Arrest and Vehicle Impoundment

3. HUD/VAWA Emergency Transfer status documented within 48 hours of arrest
4. Affiant signs documentation identifying sexual assault, stalking, and imminent threat.
5. Federal protections are legally recognized, confirming the affiant as a vulnerable adult fleeing danger.
6. The affiant exits a Walmart parking lot at approximately 15 mph. Officers deploy a tire spike device, which fails to fully stop the vehicle.
7. Several officers surround the vehicle with firearms drawn. Search reveals no weapons or contraband.
8. The vehicle is impounded; this vehicle serves as the affiant's only shelter.
9. Affiant is transported to jail and denied food for nearly the entire detention period.
10. Original criminal charge filed is later downgraded within two days prior to the initial arraignment and signature bond release.

Post Arrest—Deliberate Surveillance (September 16, 2025)

11. Different police departments conduct systematic surveillance over multiple days.
12. At least 13 documented vehicle passes in a single day; additional passes occur on surrounding days.
13. Officer Johnson, when confronted, acknowledges observation using affiant's name despite no prior contact. Surveillance continues until confrontation pierces the cover.

Court Proceedings—Remote appearance access previously granted is later denied or restricted without notice.

- Status conferences scheduled with near last minute notifications.
- Remote access inconsistently granted despite prior approval, demonstrating procedural irregularities.

Bond Restrictions: Conditions prohibit any direct or indirect contact with the complainant, a person entirely unknown to the affiant. $500 financial penalty for violations functions as a blanket gag and suppression mechanism.

Prior & Concurrent Agency Involvement

- Adult Protective Services (APS) previously involved due to documented harassment, stalking, financial exploitation, and caretaker coercion.
- APS retrieved the affiant's vehicle with police presence prior to the false complaint.
- HUD/VAWA documentation confirms federal emergency protections documented within two days of arrest. Multiple agencies' records demonstrate overlapping responsibilities and coordinated procedural actions.

Evidence Cross Reference

- Freeze Frame From Video of Stranger obstructing the roadway; initial threat confirmation.
- Photo 2 & 3: Officer confrontation; collapse of covert surveillance.
- HUD/VAWA Documentation: Federal protections ignored or interfered with.
- Complaint Replication: Spatially precise account of affiant's actions contrasts with complainant's fabricated report.
- Judicial Events: Motion acceptance/denial timeline; remote access inconsistencies. Bond Conditions: "Silence or Pay" restriction; $500 penalty.

Systemic Pattern

- Each documented action by agencies escalates rather than mitigates risk to the affiant.
- False report triggers high risk interventions, repeated surveillance, and procedural suppression.

Federal protections, prior APS involvement, and documented vulnerability are disregarded. The timeline directly demonstrates preventable harm, institutional overreaction, and systemic failure.